TOWN COUNCIL.

A Long Session Held Monday Night—Many Matters of Public Interest Considered.

The Town Council held the longest and busiest session of the year Monday night, and it was eleven o'clock before a motion to adjourn was put. In addition to passing on twenty-nine license applications and adopting the appropriation ordinance by the Council, a number of other matters received attention.

Councilman Walker brought up the question of the double taxation on dogs. He advocated a single tax on canines, either by assessment or license.

Councilman Harrison also favored a single tax.

Councilman Unangst favored a high license, in order to rid the town of many mongrel and worthless curs that infested the streets, and attacked drivers and cyclers. He alluded to Glenwood Avenue in particular as a favorite resort for useless and noisy dogs.

The matter was referred to the House Committee for investigation and report.

Councilman Harrison reported a petition from E. F. Adams of Baldwin Street for water in that street. Mr. Adams had previously applied to the Orange Water Company, but as there was no water main in the street the company declined to act in the matter, except through instructions from the Town Council. The petition was referred to the Water Committee with power.

Councilman Conlan of the Road Committee reported the awarding of the contract for broken stone for road repairs to the Osborne-Marsellis Company of Upper Montclair at $1.69 per gross ton.

Councilman Unangst of the Fire Committee submitted a number of fire matters, among them being the application of Philip Batzle of Phoenix Hose Company, No. 1, for an exemption certificate. His request was granted.

Robert Foster's election as a member of Active Hose Company, No. 2, was opposed, as were also the officers recently elected by Active Hose Company.

The Fire Committee was authorized to purchase 500 feet of new hose.

Councilman Walker submitted a petition for improvements in Myrtle Avenue, in the Second Ward. The petition was not in regular form, in accordance with the requirements of the town act, and was reported back to Mr. Walker.

Mr. Walker, as Chairman of the House Committee, reported that Collector Hardcastle recommended the adoption of the card system of keeping record of the sewer assessments. To do so would necessitate the purchase of a cabinet costing about $30, but the Collector claimed, so Mr. Walker said, that the reduction in the cost of auditing accounts that would follow the adoption of the card system would more than compensate for the cost of the cabinet inside of two years.

Councilman Moore wanted to know who would benefit by the saving, the Collector or the town. As he understood it, the Collector was paid a salary, and had ample time to attend to the accounts.

The matter was referred to the House Committee.

The Council was petitioned by a property-owner on the corner of Belmont and Bloomfield Avenues to have the water mains laid in that section of the town. This is the first of many petitions that are likely to come from south of Grove Street.

An appropriation of $2,000 was voted to the Board of Health for smallpox expenses. Mr. Moore wanted the appropriation laid over until the Council was furnished with an itemized statement of what bills the Board of Health had to pay.

Mr. Conlan explained that part of the money would go to pay the hospital employees and the quarantine guards, and it would not be just to compel them to wait three weeks or more for their pay.

The appropriation was finally voted, and also a resolution passed instructing the Clerk to notify the Board of Health of the Council's request for an itemized statement of expenditures.

E. A. Rayner submitted the request of George B. Tucker of the American House to have a section of the license suspended on Thursday evening, the 19th inst., for the benefit of the Order of Elks. The Council informed Mr. Tucker that it had no legal power to suspend the ordinance.

A Timely Observance.

A gentleman living on Broad Street enjoys the proud distinction of being the only resident in his neighborhood who observed "Flag Day." Neighbors and passers-by, among them teachers and school-children, inquired why "Old Glory" floated from his house on Saturday, June 14. It is to be hoped that a more general observance of the day will be made when it occurs again.

For Fishing Tackle, go to SMITH'S, 25 Broad Street.—Adv.

LICENSE NIGHT.

TOWN COUNCIL PASSES ON HOTEL AND SALOON LICENSES.

A Great Throng of People in Attendance—Some Hotly Contested Applications—Conservatives Come Out Victorious.

Monday night was license night at the Town Council meeting, and it was one of the most interesting sessions of that body since the adoption of the town act. The result of the local election in the spring gave rise to an impression that there would be a radical departure from the conservative policy that has prevailed in the town with respect to the saloon business since the town act went into effect, and it was freely predicted that a more "liberal" course would be followed and more licenses granted.

In anticipation of a [illegible] contest between the conservative element and the advocates of unlimited licenses, a large throng of people filled the Council chamber and the corridor and anterooms. The Broad Street sidewalk of the bank building was crowded with people long before the doors opened. The doors were not opened until 7.45 o'clock, and a few moments afterward the Council chamber was jammed even to standing room.

The saloon-keepers and their friends were largely in the majority in the throng, but the final outcome of the contest was a disappointment to many of them, as the conservatives came out victorious in the fight, and successfully combated any material increase in the number of saloons. The following licenses were granted without opposition:

George B. Tucker, John Kidd, Ernest Raaflaub, Alicia Kelly, Harry Snyder & Son, Peter A. Wade, Arthur L. Authaeuser, William Ashworth, William Parting, Alfred Johnson, J. Gilbert Brady, Henry Treiber, Israel Berman, Thomas A. Hallinan, Clarence M. Smith, Frank Narucki, Elizabeth Metz, Joseph Reinheimer and S. Scheuer & Bro., the two last named being wholesale licenses.

The applications for license that were refused were Margaret Stewart, Thomas Brady, Theodore O. Steenwerth, Daniel O'Connor, Constante Zbikowsky, John Putchlopek, and Marion Gassinsky.

The applicants that were opposed but eventually granted were those of William J. Raab, Julius Petrein, and Nicholas Duggan.

Out of the twenty-nine applications before the Council, nineteen licenses for inns and taverns, one license for a saloon, and two wholesale licenses were granted. Theodore O. Steenwerth and Margaret Stewart's applications were refused, were among last year's licensees. Elizabeth Metz and Nicholas Duggan, whose applications were granted, were new applicants.

The granting of the licenses ran along smoothly until the application of William J. Raab was reached. Councilman Unangst, who stood sponsor for a large number of the applicants, had offered a motion that Mr. Raab's application be granted. Councilman Conlan arose, and much to the surprise of the spectators asked that section two of the license ordinance be read by the Clerk. This section of the ordinance cites the requirements necessary for a place to be legally considered a hotel, such as spare rooms over and above family use, stables, etc.

Mr. Conlan claimed that Mr. Raab's place did not meet the requirements of the ordinance in that he had no stable.

Chairman Peterson said that Mr. Raab leased stable-rooms across the street from his place, and had shown a three years' lease for the same.

Mr. Conlan contended that the ordinance clearly specified that stables must be on the premises of the applicant, and if it was permissible to go off the premises for stables, "spare rooms" and other requirements of the ordinance could be leased in places other than the hotel premises.

Councilman Moore regretted that the matter had not been brought up before the Council had passed on a similar application, that of Mrs. Kelly. The Council, Mr. Moore said, could revoke any license where it was found that the technicalities of the ordinance had not been complied with. Mr. Raab's license was granted, Mr. Conlan voting "No."

The next applicant objected to was Julius Petrein of No. 10 Orange Street. Mr. Petrein has been in Europe for two months, and the question was raised as to who signed his application. The Clerk explained that Mr. Petrein had made his application and paid his license fee before going to Europe. The next objection was that Mr. Petrein did not comply with the Sunday requirements of the ordinance by keeping the windows of his bar-room unobstructed to public view. Mr. Petrein's license was granted, Mr. Farrand voting "No."

When Margaret Stewart's application

Continued on page 4.

LICENSE NIGHT.

Continued from page 1.

was read off, Councilman Walker objected, and Councilman Unangst moved that she be granted a license. Mr. Walker was asked to state his objections, one of which was that he believed the neighborhood would be better off without a saloon there.

Mr. Unangst spoke in favor of granting the license. He said he resided in the neighborhood and knew that a saloon was needed there.

The Rev. Charles A. Cook objected to the granting of Mrs. Stewart's application. He cited the instance of Mrs. Stewart's trial and conviction for violation of the ordinance.

Edwin A. Rayner stated to the Council that he appeared for Mrs. Stewart, and he made an address in her behalf. He said that previous to the adoption of the town act Mrs. Stewart had been granted a license year after year by the Court of Common Pleas, and no objection had been made against her place in that long period. In alluding to the trial at which she was convicted, Mr. Rayner said that she took the case up on an appeal, but the complainants failed to appear. Mrs. Stewart's application was refused, the vote being as follows: Yeas, Unangst, Harrison, and Conlan; nays, Moore, Walker, Farrand, and Peterson.

William A. Baldwin appeared as an objector to the granting of the application of Thomas Brady. Mr. Baldwin pointed out that licenses had been granted for two places in the immediate vicinity where Mr. Brady proposed to open a saloon, and there was no necessity for another place. Mr. Brady's application was refused, only two votes being recorded in favor of it.

The next application objected to was that of Theodore O. Steenwerth. Mr. Unangst moved that the license be granted. David G. Garabrant objected. Mr. Steenwerth, he said, had been charged with violating the ordinance, and in justice to those who obey the law licenses, he said, ought not to be granted to those who disobey it.

Edwin A. Rayner appeared as counsel for Mr. Steenwerth and made a strong plea for him. Mr. Rayner claimed that some peculiar circumstances entered into Mr. Steenwerth's case. He had recently been granted a transfer to a new place and had gone to great expense in fitting up the building.

Mr. Garabrant, in reply to this, said that Mr. Steenwerth was fully aware that his license expired on July 1, and should have considered that fact before laying out so much money. Mr. Steenwerth's neighbors, Mr. Garabrant said, testified that he had violated the law.

M. N. Higgins spoke in favor of granting Mr. Steenwerth a license. "He does not break the ordinance," Mr. Higgins said, "any more than Mr. Raab or any other saloon-keeper. If both break the ordinance," Mr. Higgins argued, "one has just as much right as the other to a license. None of the saloon-keepers," Mr. Higgins declared, "live up to the ordinance."

Councilman Moore expressed astonishment at the wholesale indictment of the saloon-keepers made by Mr. Higgins. Mr. Moore cited reasons why he opposed Mr. Steenwerth's application, and one was that he regarded it as a new application, and the general policy of the Council had been to keep the number of saloons down to a certain limit, and not grant new applications.

Mr. Rayner disputed the statement that Mr. Steenwerth was considered as a "new applicant," and he challenged Mr. Garabrant to prove that Mr. Steenwerth had violated the law.

Mr. Garabrant said that he did not know of his own personal knowledge that such was the case. He cited the instance of two years ago when Mr. Steenwerth was refused a license on account of the charges against him of violating the law and of keeping a disorderly place. After those who had opposed Mr. Steenwerth's license had left the meeting, the Council, Mr. Garabrant said, reconsidered its action and granted the license, and that reconsideration was due to a special plea on behalf of Mrs. Metz, the owner of the building occupied by Mr. Steenwerth, and who was dependent upon the rent for her maintenance. No such consideration, he said, entered into the present application. The application was refused, Messrs. Unangst, Conlan, and Harrison voting yea, and Messrs. Moore, Walker, Farrand, and Peterson voting no.

The next contested application was that of Daniel O'Connor, No. 160 Walnut Street. Mr. Garabrant objected to the granting of the application and passed to the Clerk a protest, signed, he claimed, by representatives of fifty-three out of the ninety families in the immediate vicinity of the proposed saloon. There was formerly a saloon conducted at the place applied for by Mr. O'Connor, but since it has been closed, Mr. Garabrant said, the locality had been much benefited and improved.

Mr. Rayner appeared for Mr. O'Connor and eulogized the applicant, who, he said, was the only native-born citizen of the town among all the applicants. The community in which Mr. O'Connor proposed to locate, Mr. Rayner said, needed a saloon more than any other part of the town, and he indulged in some reminiscences about the "Sixth Ward." Mr. Rayner handed in a counter petition to that of Mr. Garabrant's, and signed by people who wanted the saloon.

Mr. Unangst, after looking over Mr. Garabrant's petition, declared that many of the signers were residents in the vicinity of the proposed saloon. At Mr. Garabrant's request the petition was read. The counter petition did not give the residence address of the signers, and as a consequence was not read. Mr. O'Connor's application was refused.

The next application was a new one, that of Nicholas Duggan, for a saloon license in John Hyde's building, corner of Watessing Avenue and Orange Street. John Politt opposed the granting of the license, and submitted a copy of resolutions adopted by the Official Board of the Watessing M. E. Church protesting against the granting of the application. Mr. Politt said that the proposed new saloon was close by two existing saloons and was not needed in the community.

Councilman Moore objected to the granting of the application, as it was a "new one." The license was granted.

When the application of Constante Zbikowsky for a license for No. 10 Myrtle Avenue was read off the Rev. George L. Curtis arose and addressed the Council in opposition to the granting of the license. Mr. Curtis made brief and pointed remarks, and the result was that not a Councilman voted in favor of the license.

John Putchlopek applied for a license for No. 28 Second Street. Councilman Unangst made a plea in favor of granting this license. He pointed out that the refusal to grant Mrs. Stewart a license left the Bowery section without a single saloon, and the people who wanted beer would have to resort to "growler rushing."

Mr. Rayner [illegible] Jek, advo[illegible] deer second a matter of hood.

The Rev [illegible] the granting cation was

The disc[illegible] skyl's appl[illegible] 28 Second S[illegible] the crowd. Newark, [illegible] dignity that States Br[illegible] $15,000,000, and was t[illegible] scene that If Mr. Woodr[illegible] the tactics o[illegible] the latter's [illegible] cation before

Mr. Garab[illegible] ing of Mr. There upon fired a legal [illegible] and at the Council with knowledge at

"It is a [illegible] Mr. Woodruf[illegible] Judge Skinne[illegible] objects to th[illegible] must give a While this so[illegible] entirely paral[illegible] ment, it gav[illegible] a hope that t[illegible] arrived.

After laying[illegible] premise, Mr. interrogate M[illegible] fine gallery pl[illegible] man if it was[illegible] posed to the[illegible] whatever.

Mr. Garabr[illegible] not the case, the reply, and and the audie[illegible] "Carrie Natio[illegible] meat of the o[illegible]

This disres[illegible] abrant disgu[illegible] by far the lar[illegible]

Mr. Woodru[illegible] attitude and [illegible] have excited a Blaney's theatre audience shouted at Mr. Garabrant, "How long have you been a resident of this town?"

This was too much of a good thing, and everybody roared with laughter, and even the dignity of the Council was upset by the ridiculousness of the question. Mr. Garabrant was equal to the occasion, and purposely took some time before replying that he had at least been here fifty-one years.

It evidently began to dawn upon Mr. Woodruff that he was floundering in rather deep water, and he then proceeded to eulogize his client as a descendant of the Polish hero Kossuth (probably meaning Kosciusko), and he then proceeded to impress upon the Council that they could only consider such objections as would be entertained in a court of law, and he affected to treat the objections against his client's getting a license as of no legal consequence or standing.

This led Mr. Garabrant to define the position of the law and order people with respect to saloon licenses. Mr. Garabrant denied that they were opposed to all licenses. Some of the licenses just granted by the Council met the approval of the law and order people, and he would have voted for them himself if he had been a member of the Council.

Councilman Moore administered a rebuke to the representative of the United States Brewing Company (capital $15,000,000) for his flippant remarks about citizens of this town. Mr. Moore gave him to understand that the citizens were there in response to invitations from the Council, and court of law rules also applied to that phase of the case in which all speakers were entitled to the protection of the Council.

Mr. Woodruff replied in apologetic tones that he did not mean to be disrespectful.

Just before the Council proceeded to vote on the Gassinsky case Mr. Woodruff tried a last bulldozing shot by threatening certiorari if the vote was adverse to his client.

The threat was without terror, for the vote was adverse and the application refused.

The applications for wholesale license were speedily disposed of, and the most trying ordeal in the life of a Councilman was over for another year. The crowd was in varying moods at the close of the license cases. The law and order people were in a happy frame of mind. Some of the friends of disappointed applicants were angry, and gave vent to their anger in severe denunciation of the Councilmen.

The twenty places now licensed to sell liquor at retail are geographically allotted as follows: First Ward, First District, three places; Second District, three. Second Ward, three places. Third Ward, First District, five places; Second District, six.

There is only one saloon in all that portion of the town east of the canal. There are none in that portion of the First District of the Third Ward south of the Lackawanna Railroad, while Watsessing is too generously supplied.

[illegible] OFFICE [illegible]

[illegible] June 24th 1902

Mr. Wm. Douglas Moore.

Dear Sir:-

Chairman Peterson has instructed me to request your presence at a conference of the members of the Town Council and the Board of Health to be held on Wednesday evening, July 2nd 1902 at 8 P.M. in the Town Council Chamber.

Yours very truly

[illegible]

Telephone No. [illegible]

Explanation Asked

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CITIZEN:

SIR: There must be secret springs at work in the inner circles of the Town Council. The two members of the Town Council representing the Third Ward are open advocates of a liberal policy with respect to saloon licenses. They have stood on that side of the issue in several political campaigns, and their course has been repeatedly approved by the majority of voters in the ward that they represent in the Council. Both members reside in that section of the First District of the Third Ward south of the Lackawanna Railroad track, and it is a matter of comment that there is not a single saloon in that large and influential section of the Third Ward. It is up to Messrs. Conlan and Unangst to explain that situation. INQUIRER.

POST CARDS
Thomas M. Tryniski
309 Southside Street
Fulton New York
13069
www.fultonhistory.com